constant of 72.7. But for the others it ranges between 56.8 and 61.5. Okay? There is a clear difference between the 72.7 and the range of ethanol-containing syrups, a clear difference.

The P value on the right-hand side, which is pi, which is actually a measure of trend. This is a test to see if a line which compares the effect of the ethanol concentration to stability is a line that is moving all the time. So it changes from 2.5, to 5, to 7.5 and 10. It's a measure of trend. It's not a measure of significance between the syrup without ethanol and the syrups containing ethanol. They are clearly different. This information tells you that. That the trend value, the P value tells you there is no trend, or no evidence of trend anyway.

If you look at 45 degrees we have the same thing in that the syrup without ethanol has a rate constant of 231 and that is clearly different for the rate constants for the ethanol-containing syrups. They range from 173, 10 percent, to 206 and 2.5. They are clearly different.

But in addition, at 45 degrees there is also a significant trend that as you go from naught to 2.5 to 7.5 to 10 that the stability increases as well.

Q After you had made a determination that the UK data and the U.S. data at 20 degrees was not significant or reliable, did you report that, your conclusion to Mr. Atkinson?

1	A Sorry?
2	Q Did you report that conclusion to Mr. Atkinson?
3	A I agreed to write out a declaration and provide the
4	information that was necessary.
5	Q Sometime after you decided that the UK data was not
6	reliable for the reasons you expressed, and the data at 20
7	degrees centigrade was not reliable for the reasons you
8	described, did you tell Mr. Atkinson that?
9	A I believe I did, yes.
10	
	that there come a time when he requested that
1.1	you consider a statistical study at a different temperature?
12	A Yeah, Mike got in contact with me and asked me for more
L3	data. I don't know why he wanted more data. He may have
L4	wanted to have a look at more data closest to room
.5	temperature storage. So I went back to the report and
.6	realized that there was some information that wasn't reported
.7	there but was available, and that it was 37 degrees for the
8.	U.S. ingredients. At that point I asked the statistician to
9	carry out the analysis at 37, the constant temperature
0	analysis, and then provide that back to me to add into the
1	declaration I agreed to write.
2	Q I ask you to look at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 248 in your
3	binder, that's a memorandum dated October 29, 1990. Did you
4	send this to Mr. Elahi and ask him to perform a statistical
5	study on 37 degrees?

	1	mac is what I was referring to there
	2	when Mike wanted a bit more information, and this is my
	3	request to Nadeem Elahi to provide the statistical analysis
	4	on the data and provide the information to me.
	5	Q I notice there's a column headed by 37 and it has some
	6	handwritten notations under it. Were they present when you
	7	sent the memorandum to Mr. Elahi?
	8	A This version here looks to be the paper copy that I
	9	generated. So I sent an electronic copy requesting it.
	10	There wouldn't have been any information under the 37, that
	11	would have been blank. I would have then printed off a
	12	version of the electronic copy for my records, correspondence
-	13	files, and waited for the information to come back.
1	L4	Q If you look at Plaintiffs' 249, is that the memorandum
3	L5	you received back from the statistical department?
1	16	A That's right. It didn't come from Nadeem but it came
1	.7	from Gillian, who was working with Nadeem.
1	.8	Q The numbers listed in that memorandum are the same as
1	9	those written in by hand on Plaintiffs' Exhibit 248; is that
2	0	right?
2	1	A Yes, that's correct.
2	2	Q After those studies were prepared and you received them
2	3	back in November of 1990, what did you do?
2	4	A Well, at that point I drafted the declaration to
2	5	support the '249 patent.

	1	Q If you would look at what has been marked as
	2	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 250, is this the declaration which you
•	3	made oath to and signed on April 12, 1991?
	4	A Yes, that is.
	5	Q Is this a final version of the draft declaration that
	6	you originated in November of 1990?
	7	A Yes, it is.
	8	Q In paragraph 5 of the declaration you state that in my
	9	laboratory it was found that for an aqueous-based ranitidine
1	LO	formulation a significant and surprising enhancement in the
1	.1	stability of ranitidine is achieved by the addition of
1	2	ethanol to the formulation.
	. 2	
1	.3	Was that your view then when you made this
1	.3	Was that your view then when you made this
1	.3	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now?
1 1	.3	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it
1 1	.3 4 5 6 7	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability.
1 1 1 1	.3 .4 .5 .6 .7	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising
1 1 1 1	3 4 5 6 7 8	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising because it's an invention.
1 1 1 1 1:	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising because it's an invention. Q Now, if you look at the table that you used to support
1 1 1 1:	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising because it's an invention. Q Now, if you look at the table that you used to support your opinion on the next page, the table in boxes with
1 1 1 1: 2:	3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising because it's an invention. Q Now, if you look at the table that you used to support your opinion on the next page, the table in boxes with ethanol and without ethanol, was that table derived from the
1 1 1 1: 2: 2: 2:	3 4 5 6 7 8 8 9 0 1 1 2 2	Was that your view then when you made this declaration and is it your view now? A Yes, it was my view when I made the declaration and it is my view now. It's a significant enhancement in stability and the data shows that quite clearly. It's surprising because it's an invention. Q Now, if you look at the table that you used to support your opinion on the next page, the table in boxes with ethanol and without ethanol, was that table derived from the statistical report that you had received back in May with the

That is correct.

25

	1	Q That's the source of that information?
	2	A That is right. It entirely comes from the original
	3	Nadeem Elahi report plus the 37-degree data that I requested.
	4	Q If you will look at the second table, the box on the
	5	final page of your declaration, this again supports your view
	6	that there is a significant and surprising enhancement in the
	7	stability of the product with ethanol; is that right?
	8	A Very much so, yes. As I pointed out before, there is a
	9	clear difference between all the ranges of percentages of
į	10	ethanol-containing syrup and the syrup without ethanol.
:	11	Q What was the source of this table, Doctor?
1	12	A The source of that table again was the Nadeem Elahi
J	L3	report.
1	L 4	Q I believe it's Table 3.1 and 3.2 that you previously
1	.5	testified about.
1	.6	A Yes, 3.2 in the report.
1	.7	Q Finally, Doctor, there's a fourth program which is
1	.8	referred to in the introduction on the statistical report
1	9	entitled Definitive Experiments, Zantac Solution. Do you see
2	0	what I'm referring to?
2	1	A Yes.
2	2	Q Would you tell Judge Davis what you found from that
2	3	study?
2	4	A Well, this study is Zantac solution, so it's not the
2	5	same formulation as the syrup. This is again comparing

ethanol and no ethanol programs.

This also clearly showed a difference between the ethanol and no ethanol showing that ethanol provided the stability enhancing effect and a clearly significant one.

O Is that reflected in the tables, Table 4.1 and 4.2 in the report?

A Yes, it is. Look at table 4.1, which is looking at the analysis of rate constants for the Zantac solution with and without ethanol, the ethanol-containing solution has a rate constant of 217, clearly different from the one, the 262, the no-ethanol-containing one, and it's highly significant because the P value is less than .05.

Q This information in this data would also support your opinion that a significant and surprising enhancement in the stability of the solution is achieved by the addition of ethanol, would it not?

A Very much so, yes, it would.

Q And yet from my reading of the declaration, Dr.

Hempenstall, I don't see where you have added this supporting data; is that right?

A That is correct. I felt no need to do so because I felt that what I put in the declaration was representative, reliable, conclusive and I didn't feel there was a need to add that as well.

Q A final question. You were in the courtroom on Tuesday

```
and the U.S. ingredient syrup, that is just generically,
   1
       comparing those two. I don't know about these batches here.
   2
       I don't know about the batches that were set up. I have
   3
       explained when you look at the two of them as described in
   4
      the documents they have a slightly different way of
  5
      expressing ethanol, but other than that they are the same.
  6
  7
            What is the different way of expressing ethanol?
  8
            It's calculated in a different way. I can't remember
      the exact details now. It's to do with the specification of
  9
      ethanol in the USP against the ethanol in the BP.
 10
            That is for testing for identity purposes, correct?
 11
            I would have to refer to it. I can't recall.
 12
 13
            Did you use the same amount of ethanol in -- I'm still
     on Defendants' 16, did you use the same amount of ethanol in
 14
     all the programs under number one as you did under number 2?
15
16
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Rubin, he said
     repeatedly he didn't do the testing. He didn't do the
17
     testing so he didn't use any alcohol or ethanol; am I right?
18
19
               THE WITNESS: That's right, I didn't do it. I
20
     didn't set them up.
               THE COURT: His testimony on direct I thought was
21
     very clear. He compiled some statistics and he got a report
22
    and on the basis of his analysis of that report he did a
23
    declaration. That's what he did.
24
25
              MR. RUBIN: Your Honor, there was testimony during
```